



## CALIFORNIA URBAN WATER AGENCIES

DATE: January 21, 2005

TO: Bulletin 160-03 Advisory Committee, DWR staff

FROM: Steve Macaulay, Executive Director

**SUBJECT: Urban Caucus Comments re. "Reviewer's Guide"**

---

Listed below are the suggestions made by the Urban Caucus during the Advisory Committee meeting yesterday as inserts to the Reviewer's Guide. Our suggestions are organized by the three different headings.

### Outline Questions Reviewers Should Consider in Assessing Plan

1. Are the implementation challenges for the Plan adequately addressed?
2. What is my organization's role in implementing the Plan: leadership, actions, funding?
3. Does the Plan adequately address water needs in dry years?
4. What are the consequences if this Plan, or any of its elements, do not get implemented?
5. How are Californians going to pay for this?
6. The Plan had input from an Advisory Committee that represented a broad range of California stakeholders, although not every member agrees with every recommendation.
7. How does this assist in meeting local urban water supply and quality needs?
8. How do I access data that will help in my local water supplier plans?
9. What does this Plan do to help meet long-term drinking water quality needs?
10. How will the Plan achieve water management, economic and environmental goals?

11. Are the complexities of water planning satisfactorily outlined and considered?
12. What does this Plan mean to local government and businesses?
13. What are the connections between water supply and growth?
14. How does this state Plan relate to the regional planning process?

#### Explain Where and Why Tension Exists in the Current Document

1. There is disagreement within the Advisory Committee on the utility and need for additional surface storage.
2. The balance between local water resources actions (water use efficiency, desalination, conjunctive use) and large-scale projects is still uncertain.
3. Achieving projected benefits relies on dealing successfully with implementation challenges that have not adequately been identified and addressed.
4. The Plan only works if funding at the federal, state and local levels is available. In the current financial environment, funding at all levels is in jeopardy.
5. Required actions to sustain water supply reliability are borne by local water agencies, without identifying mechanisms to enforce or induce action.
6. Successful implementation relies in part on defining “beneficiary” and outlining how the principle of “beneficiaries pay” is implemented.
7. It has been difficult for DWR to address the sometimes-competing interests of the Advisory Committee members. To some extent this represents different philosophical approaches to dealing with California water problems.
8. There are splits among different interest groups on some issues.
9. There are linkages between water supply and growth.

#### Outline Features You Find Particularly Good

1. The Plan focuses on regional implementation.
2. This California Water Plan Update addresses, for the first time, some of the challenges in implementing recommendations.
3. The Plan includes multiple “no action” future scenarios.

4. There are solid links to CALFED, avoiding duplication of efforts and recognizing the important role the CALFED Bay-Delta Program has in California water issues.
5. The Plan recognizes the importance of water quality to reliability of urban water supplies.
6. The Plan is a call to action.